

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 20 were examined and stand rejected under 35 USC 102 (e). The specific rejection set forth in the March 24, 2005 Office Action is based on the Examiner's position that the Robinson patent "anticipates the claimed detection apparatus and method of fabrication".

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection based on Robinson, for many reasons:

First, applicant does not claim either a detection apparatus or a method of fabrication. The present invention claims are directed to a device for use in the detection of airborne contaminants and a method of creating and storing airborne contaminant samples and identification data for subsequent detection. The present invention device captures and carries the airborne contaminants but does not detect them. Subsequent detection is attained with the use of appropriate instrumentation.

Second, Robinson does not teach or suggest the use of a carrier as specifically required in all of the present invention claims. Robinson uses an acid-base indicator, with no teaching or even suggestion that the Robinson device is used to store contaminants for subsequent testing as in the present invention.

Third, Robinson does not have a unique identifier on his device as claimed herein. The present invention requires a unique identifier for each device. In other words, as described in the present invention specification, the unique identifier can be used to identify such things as names, dates ,id


numbers, social security numbers or other combinations. The functionality of the present invention requires unique (one of a kind) identifiers, whereas Robinson uses the same bar code or identifier for all envelopes of a given facility or even all envelopes tested to show verification. These Robinson codes are not unique to each substrate and only symbolize a verification.

Fourth, the unique identifiers of the present invention are specifically claimed to be on the same substrate as the carrier. Robinson doesn't even have a contaminant carrier, but has an acid-base indicator. However, the Robinson acid-base indicator is on a different substrate from the Robinson verification code, contrary to the present invention. Further, the Robinson device to be worn on a glove shown in Figures 11 and 12 have no identifier whatsoever.

In view of all of the above differentiations and reasons, it is urged that new claims 21 through 40 should be allowed. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4 April 2005



Kenneth P. Glynn
Reg. No. 26,893
24 Mine Street
Flemington, NJ 08822
(908) 788-0077 Tele
(908) 788-3999 Fax

KPG:hub
CM RRR No. 7002 2030 0007 1762 7783